

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed July 9, 2009, and in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration is requested. Claims 16, 18, 20 and 21 are pending in the application, all of which are independent. Claims 1-15 have been withdrawn from consideration and have been cancelled, and claims 17 and 19 have been cancelled.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Independent claims 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 272,529 to Fredericksen (Frederiksen). Claims 17 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 further in view of facts of which the Examiner has taken Official Notice.

The independent claims 16 and 18 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 17 and 19, namely that the data indicative of the substantially redundant consecutive images is stored *in association with the compressed* video information. Independent claims 20 and 21 also have been amended to recite that there is compressed video information and data indicative of the substantially redundant consecutive images *stored therewith*. Fredericksen says nothing about storing data indicative of substantially redundant consecutive images in association with the compressed video information. Thus, in view of the amendments, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of claims 16 and 18 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action relies on Col. 12, lines 54-56 of Frederiksen for describing “storing the compressed video information and the data indicative of the substantially redundant consecutive images.” However, this portion of Frederiksen only describes storing the compressed video data. It does not also describe storing the data indicative of the substantially redundant consecutive images.

With respect to claims 17 and 19, however, the Office Action asserted that Frederiksen describes, at Col. 5, lines 8-25, that this data indicative of the substantially redundant consecutive images is used to identify and remove the redundant images, and therefore is stored. However, this portion of Frederiksen only describes temporarily storing this data during compression, and not storing this data in association with the compressed video data.

Because Frederiksen does not describe or suggest storing the data indicative of the substantially redundant consecutive images *with* the compressed video information, the subject matter of claims 16 and 18, as amended, is not rendered obvious and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding independent claims 20 and 21, as amended, Frederiksen does not describe decompression of compressed video information using data indicative of the substantially redundant consecutive images that has been *stored with* the compressed video information. At Col 5, lines 8-25, Frederiksen merely describes how the film images are transferred to video tape format prior to compression. Frederiksen does not describe decompression that uses the “data indicating where the substantially redundant consecutive images *were* located”.

Claims 20 and 21, in contrast, presume some prior compression of video information has occurred, and substantially redundant consecutive images were removed in that process, and the “data indicating where the substantially redundant consecutive images *were* located” had been stored. This information from the compression process is stored and reused during decompression. Frederiksen does not describe these limitations.

Because Frederiksen does not describe or suggest decompression that uses compressed video information and “data indicating where the substantially redundant consecutive images *were* located”, the subject matter of claims 20 and 21, as amended, is not rendered obvious and the rejection should be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the outstanding rejections should be withdrawn. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Applicants request the Examiner call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including any extension fee or fee for claims, please charge any fee to **Deposit Account No. 50-0876**.

Filed via EFS-Web  
on October 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Oliver Strimpel/

Oliver Strimpel  
Registration No. 56,451  
Attorney for Applicants  
Avid Technology, Inc.  
One Park West  
Tewksbury, MA 01876  
Tel.: (978) 640-6789